

□ 2130

concerned about in Afghanistan. We are interested in drying up this problem, and we should be in it together; and I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) really means to dry that up, but that is the effect of part of what he is doing here.

It would also prevent DOD from being able to reprogram funds, as he suggests. Those funds provide flexibility for the Department, which they often need, especially in a circumstance like this when we are really in a war setting; but they do that reprogramming after approval from the authorizing in the Committee on Appropriations. It is not an unusual thing. It is a part of our regular activity. It does tend to deny the kind of flexibility that we need for these sorts of military activities, but essentially the gentleman's provision strips out language we carried in provisions of this bill and other bills, language which combines the need to give our forces all the flexibility that is a part of a very difficult region.

I am not sure that he is really getting a handle on what he had hoped to prevent that he thinks happens out there, but this is a relationship between the committees and the Department of Defense, similar to the ones that the gentleman has between his committee and the Energy Department. It is not always perfect, but it works pretty good so far.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The problem with the bill the way it is written is that, for example, the \$73 million, which we all agree should be put in for drug interdiction, could just get shifted out of drug interdiction over to a Defense Department R&D program, a procurement program. We will not have any say over that. We agree on the drug interdiction, but Rumsfeld can put it anywhere he wants.

My amendment does not cut a single nickel out of this entire budget. What it says, though, is if they want to reprogram it, they have got to come back to us. If they have changed their mind on drug interdiction, if they want \$1.3 billion in walking-around money to give to Jordan or any other country, they come back to us. They ask for our permission. This is a war in which we are the elected people of our country. This is where "no taxation without representation" started as a revolution in my district. It was about a war. It was about taxation. It was about proper representation.

I do not believe the American people want to hand over to Donald Rumsfeld and over to Condoleezza Rice and over to Wolfowitz and all of them the authority to make decisions which we, as their elected representatives greeting the body bags coming back to our district, are expected to make on behalf of our constituents.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I have been involved in this sort of providing of flexibility for a long, long time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts was not correct in suggesting that they could reprogram money out of drug control efforts. Indeed, if they want to make some reprogramming from one drug control effort to another, they have to come to us to get our permission before the fact. Indeed, I think the gentleman is chasing after windmills that do not exist in this particular provision.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I think because the Red Sox are ahead, the gentleman has gotten really vigorous here in his opposition. He thinks he is on a roll here.

No, we have tight control over the Pentagon. They do not do anything without coming to us. They ask us for permission for everything. They come to this committee, your Committee on Appropriations, and make sure that they get what they wanted.

Mr. Chairman, we have limited them substantially from what they originally asked, and I would hope Members would oppose this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that under the unanimous consent request, pro forma amendments by the managers on each side are still allowed, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just must respond to the comments made about the necessity to leave maximum flexibility with the Pentagon. I would simply observe that we did that with the last \$60 billion that we gave them, and that is, I guess, how we came up with 40,000 troops that still did not have the Kevlar linings for their body armor; that flexibility is how we came up with an inadequate number of jammers so that our soldiers are still dying and being maimed by remotely detonated

bombs; I guess that is why some of the Humvees over there still are not protected with Kevlar blankets; and I guess that is how we came up with the recommendation from the Pentagon that still leaves 80 percent of our troops in Iraq without drinkable water.

So I think we ought to keep that in mind when we hear these general discussions about the need for "flexibility." Flexibility for people whose judgment has earned that flexibility is one thing; flexibility for people who have demonstrated an interest in keeping as much information away from the Congress as possible and who have a track record of making as many miscalculations as possible is not something that thrills me very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLT:
Page 30, lines 1 and 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$900,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of problems with this legislation; the lack of planning to turn the rebuilding over to Iraqis, the lack of planning to involve other countries, the lack of attention to domestic concerns, such as the health care for our veterans, and the flexibility that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just spoke about that certainly betray a lack of planning in the sense that the Pentagon has to ask for total flexibility in how they might use the money in the future. But I would like to talk about one specific thing that is wrong with this bill.

When I was growing up, we had a phrase called "taking coals to Newcastle." It meant pointless activity, redundant activity.

The chairman might call it taking oranges to Florida, or the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) might call it taking potatoes to Idaho, or the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) might call it taking snow to Alaska.

This legislation before us today creates a new unbelievable expression for America, taking oil to Iraq. My amendment would eliminate the \$900 million of taxpayer money, American taxpayer money, that would be used to import petroleum to Iraq. Think about it. Petroleum to Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, why are we dunning our taxpayers for hundreds of millions of dollars to import petroleum products into the country which has the